

made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is determined to be the most advantageous to the Government.

All proposals will be evaluated based on the technical, past performance, price factors, and facilities described in this section. Proposals will be evaluated with a view toward the award of the contract presenting the most favorable offer to the Government, therefore, proposals must contain such information as may be required to conduct a detailed and thorough evaluation.

The Offeror's proposal must give clear, detailed information sufficient to enable evaluation based on the major factors and subfactors listed below.

Major factors considered in the evaluation of offers are as follows:

- **Technical:** This factor will receive a narrative description and will be rated higher than Past Performance and Price. **For all Offerors in the competitive range, the Live Test Demonstration will affect the rating of this factor.**
- **Past Performance:** The Offeror's proposal will receive a rating based on documented information regarding such factors as quality, timeliness, customer satisfaction, cost control and business practices that the Offeror has demonstrated on projects of a similar scope and nature in the past.
- **Cost/Price:** The cost/price proposal will be evaluated for magnitude and realism. Price factors will also be used as a further indication of the Offeror's understanding of the scope of the requirement. Total Life Cycle Costs to the Government, both direct and indirect, will be evaluated.

Facilities: The facilities proposal, including sub-proposals for each site proposed to house the HPCS, will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis for the viability of the proposed facility solution to meet the Government's requirements. The evaluation will be presented as a narrative description.

- **M.2.1 Basis for Award**

The contract awarded as a result of this Request for Proposals (RFP) will be an integrated assessment by the Contracting Officer of the results of the evaluation based on the evaluation factors and their relative order of importance as indicated below.

Ultimately, the source selection decision will take into account the Contractor's capability to meet the requirements of this solicitation on a timely and cost-effective basis. The Government reserves such right of flexibility in making the source selection to assure placement of a contract in the Government's best interest in accordance with the evaluation criteria.

Accordingly, the Government may award any resulting contract to other than the lowest-priced Offeror, or other than the Offeror with the highest technical merit.

The following subfactors will be considered (all subfactors are of equal importance):

- Quality of products or service, compliance with contract requirements, accuracy of reports and technical excellence.
- Timeliness of performance and reliability.
- Cost control, remaining within budget, current accurate and complete billing, relationship of negotiated costs to actuals and being cost effective.
- Satisfaction of customer end users with the contractor's service.
- Business relations, management, and effective subcontracting program, reasonable and effective contractor-recommended solutions.

Assessment of the Offeror's past performance will be one means of evaluating the credibility of the Offeror's proposal, and relative capability to meet performance requirements.

Information will also be considered regarding and significant subcontractors.

Evaluation of past performance will include a determination of the Offeror's commitment to customer satisfaction and will include conclusions of informed judgment. The basis for the past performance rating will be documented.

During discussions Offeror's will be given an opportunity to address unfavorable reports of past performance, if the Offeror has not had a previous opportunity to review the rating. Recent contracts will be examined to ensure that corrective measures have been implemented. Prompt corrective action in isolated instances may not outweigh overall negative trends.

If an Offeror does not have a past performance history relating to this solicitation, the Offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on this factor.

M.5 COST/PRICE

The cost/price proposal will be evaluated for magnitude and realism, but will not be numerically scored. To be considered acceptable under this solicitation, the Offeror must propose fixed prices for the items to be acquired.

M.6 FACILITIES

The Facility Proposal will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis for the viability of the proposed facility infrastructure plan to meet Government requirements. Factors to be considered include, but are not limited to, the completeness and realism of the proposed solution (e.g., facility capabilities to support the proposed HPC systems, plans and schedule for proposed site modifications, and strategies to accommodate system upgrades and expansion) and its risk to the Government.

A site visit by the Government to the Contractor-provided facilities may be conducted as part of the evaluation process

In the event an unfavorable evaluation is received (a failing grade) on the Facility Proposal, the entire proposal shall be determined unacceptable.

M.7 EVALUATION FACTORS

All technical and Past Performance portions of proposals will be evaluated using the criteria listed in Table 1 below. Each Offeror will be assigned a Summary Rating for its Technical and Past Performance, determined through evaluation of its proposal.

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria

ADJECTIVE RATING	DESCRIPTION
Unacceptable	PROPOSED APPROACH HAS MANY DEFICIENCIES OR PROPOSED APPROACH IS TOTALLY WITHOUT MERIT. PAST PERFORMANCE UNACCEPTABLE.
Inadequate	PROPOSED APPROACH HAS ONE OR MORE DEFICIENCIES OR MAJOR WEAKNESSES, AND IS NOT CAPABLE OF IMPROVEMENT TO ACCEPTABLE OR BETTER WITHOUT ADOPTION OF A NEW APPROACH. PAST PERFORMANCE MORE NEGATIVE THAN ACCEPTABLE.
Marginal	PROPOSED APPROACH HAS DEFICIENCIES OR SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESSES, BUT IS CAPABLE OF IMPROVEMENT TO ACCEPTABLE OR BETTER WITHOUT ADOPTION OF NEW APPROACH. NO OR NEUTRAL PAST PERFORMANCE.
Acceptable	PROPOSED APPROACH FULLY MEETS THE REQUIREMENT WITH NO DEFICIENCY OR SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESS. PAST PERFORMANCE MORE POSITIVE THAN NEGATIVE.